Suppl. 1. Strengths and limitations of five popular plagiarism detection software programs.

Software	Limitation	Strength
Turnitin (Turnitin LLC) [1,2]	Can be expensive for individual users or small organizations Can produce false positives, particularly for commonly used phrases or references May not be as effective at detecting certain types of plagiarism, such as paraphrasing or manipulation of images or data	Has a large database of sources for comparison, including academic journals, periodicals, and web pages Provides detailed feedback on potential instances of plagiarism, including a similarity score and links to matched sources Has a user-friendly interface that is easy to navigate
PlagScan (Turnitin LLC) [3]	Can be expensive for individual users or small organizations May not be as effective at detecting plagiarism in languages other than English Some users have reported issues with the accuracy of the software, particularly for documents with complex formatting or graphics	Uses advanced algorithms to analyze submitted documents for potential plagiarism, including paraphrasing and manipulation of data Has a large database of sources for comparison, including academic journals, web pages, and user-uploaded documents Offers a range of customization options for users, such as the ability to exclude certain sources or sections of the document from the analysis
Grammarly (Grammarly Inc) [4,5]	Plagiarism detection feature is not as comprehensive as other tools, and may miss certain instances of plagiarism Does not have as large a database of sources for comparison as other tools May produce false positives for common phrases or references	Provides a range of writing feedback, including grammar and spelling suggestions, as well as a plagiarism checker Offers a user-friendly interface and integrates with a variety of platforms and tools, including Microsoft Word (Microsoft Corp) and Google Docs (Google LLC) Can be used for free, with a premium subscription available for additional features
Copyscape (Indigo Stream Technologies Ltd) [6,7]	Has a smaller database of sources for comparison than other tools, which can affect the accuracy of the results Can be less effective at detecting certain types of plagiarism, such as manipulation of data or images Some users have reported issues with the accuracy of the software, particularly for documents with complex formatting or graphics	Provides quick and easy analysis of submitted documents for potential plagiarism Offers a range of customization options for users, such as the ability to exclude certain sources or sections of the document from the analysis Has a relatively low cost for individual users or small organizations
iThenticate [8,9]	Can be expensive for individual users or small organizations May produce false positives for common phrases or references May not be as effective at detecting certain types of plagiarism, such as manipulation of images or data Some users have reported issues with the accuracy of the software, particularly for documents with complex formatting or graphics	Offers a large database of sources for comparison, including academic journals, periodicals, and web pages Provides detailed feedback on potential instances of plagiarism, including a similarity score and links to matched sources Has a user-friendly interface that is easy to navigate Offers a range of customization options for users, such as the ability to exclude certain sources or sections of the document from the analysis Is particularly effective at detecting plagiarism in academic writing and research, and is widely used in the publishing industry

References

1. Brown V, Robin J, Rubin N, Arome G. Strengths and weaknesses of plagiarism detection software. J Lit Technol 2010;11:110–64. http://www.literacyandtechnology.org/uploads/1/3/6/8/136889/jlt_v11_1_brown_etal.pdf
2. Bensal ER, Miraflores ES, Tan NC. Plagiarism: shall we turn to Turnitin? CALL-EJ 2013;14:2–22. http://callej.org/journal/14-2/Bensal_Miraflores_Tan_2013.pdf
3. Hiremath SA, Otari MS. Plagiarism detection: different methods and their analysis: review. Int J Innov Res Adv Eng 2014;1:41–7. https://www.ijirae.com/volumes/vol1/issue7/AUCS10085.06.pdf
4. Ebadi S, Gholami M, Vakili S. Investigating the effects of using *Grammarly* in EFL writing: the case of articles. Comput Sch 2023;40:85–105. https://doi.org/10.1080/07380569.2022.2150067
5. Barrot JS. Integrating technology into ESL/EFL writing through Grammarly. RELC J 2022;53:764–8. https://doi.org/10.1177/0033688220966632

6. Elkhatat AM, Elsaid K, Almeer S. Some students plagiarism tricks, and tips for effective check. Int J Educ Integr 2021;17:15. https://doi.org/10.1007/s40979-021-00082-w
7. Foltýnek T, Dlabolová D, Anohina-Naumeca A, et al. Testing of support tools for plagiarism detection. Int J Educ Technol High Educ 2020;17:46. https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-020-00192-4
8. Hong CJ, McInnes MD, Hibbert RM, et al. Duplicate publication in radiology journals. AJR Am J Roentgenol 2015;204: W573–8. https://doi.org/10.2214/AJR.14.13461
9. Taylor DB. Journal club: plagiarism in manuscripts submitted to the AJR: development of an optimal screening algorithm and management pathways. AJR Am J Roentgenol 2017;208:712–20. https://doi.org/10.2214/AJR.16.17208